

REMARKS

Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings in view of the enclosed Replacement Sheet 1/2 in which Fig. 2 has been labeled as "PRIOR ART".

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Argintaru '260.

Such a rejection requires that Argintaru disclose, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of claims 1 and 5, or in other words, that each of claims 1 and 5 be readable, either expressly or inherently, on Argintaru's disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that clearly such is **not** the case here.

More specifically, Argintaru does not teach or even suggest Applicant's claimed "microwave filter"; rather, Argintaru merely teaches a "microwave frequency discriminator...for directly transforming frequency modulation on a microwave carrier into a demodulated lower frequency". Thus, and furthermore, Argintaru does not teach or even suggest Applicant's claimed "means coupled to said at least two dielectric resonators for resonating with said at least two dielectric resonators and for attenuating an undesired frequency of signals transmitted by said transmission microstrip" as required by independent parent claim 1.

Therefore, claims 1 and 5 clearly are **not** readable, either expressly or inherently, on Argintaru's disclosure.

Applicant also respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yrjola '489, as Yrjola '489

clearly does not teach, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of claim 1, or in other words, claim 1 is not readable, either expressly or inherently, on Yrjola's disclosure.

More specifically, Yrjola clearly does not teach or suggest Applicant's "means comprising at least one lateral microstrip extending, over its entire length, **only** transversely to said microstrip"; rather, Yrjola's microstrips 31, 35 are described as being "adjacent" to the microstrips 33, 37, and at least portions of microstrips 31, 35 are illustrated in Fig. 3B as being **parallel** to the microstrips 33, 37.

Thus, since claim 1 is not readable, either expressly or inherently, on Yrjola's disclosure, Yrjola is **incapable** of "anticipating" Applicant's claim 1.

Applicant also respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 4 (4/1) and 6 (6/1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Argintaru '260. The deficiencies in the disclosure of Argintaru relative to the independent parent claim 1 have already been discussed above. Because of these deficiencies, it is clear that Argintaru does not teach, or even remotely suggest, all of the limitations in parent claim 1. Thus, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Argintaru shows the relative permittivity and length values specified by the Examiner, Argintaru's disclosure would not have rendered obvious the subject matter, taken as a whole, of each of the dependent claims 4/1 and 6/1.

Applicant notes the **allowability** of dependent claims 2, 3, and 7-10 if they are rewritten in independent form. These claims have been so rewritten, and, therefore, now should be **allowable**.

Applicant has inserted a new dependent claim 11 (11/1) to recite another feature of a preferred embodiment of the invention, this feature being supported in Applicant's specification at page 6, lines 26-27, whereby new claim 11 should be allowable for the same reason that its parent claim 1 is allowable, and for the additional reason of the limitation added by claim 11.

In summary, then, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all objections and rejections, and to find the application to be in condition for allowance with all of claims 1-11. However, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

N.B. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to return an **initialed copy** of the Form PTO-1449 which was attached to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 5, 2002, with the application.


Applicant also encloses an Excess Claim Fee Payment Letter (with fee) to cover the cost of the one excess independent claim generated by this Amendment.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/087,835

Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 19, 2003